



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/811,653	03/19/2001	Dietrich Klakow	DE00046	7775
24737	7590 04/26/2004		EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			LERNER, MARTIN	
P.O. BOX 30 BRIARCLIF	01 F MANOR, NY 10510		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
Diameter.			2654	
			DATE MAILED: 04/26/2004	/0

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/811,653	KLAKOW ET AL.	
ravicery rieden	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Martin Lerner	2654	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 05 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely	ation. A proper reply n places the applica	y to a tion in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the condition of the con	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THOUSE OF THE CONTRACT OF THE CONTR	g date of the final rejecting FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the apprount of the fee. The appropriginally set in the final	on. See MPEP opriate extension opriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF			
$2. \boxtimes$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) 🛛 they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sir	nplifying the
(d) 🛛 they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim	s.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:	reconsideration has been consideration.	dered but does NO	Γ place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	·		nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 1 to 11.			٠
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b) disapproved by the	ne Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	it(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	•	
10. Other:			
		HEMOND DORVIL ORY PATENT EXAM	MINER

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Continuation of 2. NOTE:



New independent claim 12 raises new issues, requiring further search and/or consideration, as the claim is considerably broader than independent claims 1 and 7 to 9. Furthermore, new independent claim 12 is incomplete, as it ends with a comma, raising issues under 35 USC 112.

Regarding the amendments to independent claims 1 and 7 to 9, it is not agreed that these amendment distinguish over Klakow, which also iteratively generates a final text corpus by selecting articles from a larger corpus in accordance with selection criteria. Thus, the rejection of claims 1 to 6, 8, 10, and 11 as being clearly anticipated by Klakow must stand until such time as Applicants submit a certified translation of the foreign priority document.

Regarding the amendments to independent claims 1 and 7 to 9, it is not agreed that these amendment distinguish over Ramaswamy et al., or a combination of Ramaswamy et al. and Bandara et al. Ramaswamy et al. also iteratively generates a final language model until a sufficient number of linguistic units are extracted, which is a selection criteria.